

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 10-24 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,123,243 (Kawasaki) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,801,849 (Szukala) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,422 (Barker). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Szukala, Barker, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,603,494 (Banks). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Szukala, Barker and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,598,527 (Debrus). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Szukala, Barker and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,859,628 (Ross). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Szukala, Barker and further in view of U.S. Patent 7,154,481 (Cross). These rejections are respectfully traversed. Applicants hereby request reconsideration and allowance of the claims in view of the following arguments.

Regarding the obviousness rejection of independent claim 1 based on Kawasaki, Szukala, and Barker, this claim has been amended to recite that the touch sensitive active region is pressure sensitive, and the touch sensitive active region is defined responsive to a pressure applied to the display screen by user contact with the display element. This amendment is fully supported, for example, at paragraph 0021 of the present application. No new matter has been added. This feature provides for improved ergonomics and performance for the claimed display. For example, the size of the touch sensitive active region can be increased as the user presses the display harder, eventually encompassing the position of the user's finger or glove.

None of the cited Kawasaki, Szukala, and Barker references teaches or even suggests this feature of amended claim 1. Therefore, any combination of these references, however made, would still be missing this claimed feature, and it would not have been obvious to add this feature to any Kawasaki/Szukala/Barker combination to yield the invention of claim 1.

Consequently, claim 1 is patentable, as are claims 2-4 and 7, which depend from claim 1.

Regarding the obviousness rejections of claims 5, 6, 8, and 9 based on Kawasaki, Szukala, and Barker in combination with Banks, Debrus, Ross or Cross, none of the additional cited references teaches or suggests displaying the claimed pressure sensitive active region of amended claim 1, from which these claims depend. Therefore, any combination of Kawasaki, Szukala, and Barker with these references, however made, would be missing this claimed feature, and it would not have been obvious to add this feature to any Kawasaki/Szukala/Barker/Banks/Debrus/Ross/Cross combination.

Consequently, claims 5, 6, 8, and 9 are patentable.

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Michael A. Messina
Registration No. 33,424

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MAM/llg
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: February 24, 2011

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**